R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 839 AC 002 071

A TURNING TO TAKE NEXT, ALTERNATIVE GOALS IN THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN. NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS, 47.

BY- GOLDMAN, FREDA H.
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUC. FOR ADULTS

PUB DATE 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.64 64P.

DESCRIPTORS- #LEISURE TIME, #WOMENS EDUCATION, #EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, WORKING WOMEN, VOLUNTEERS, PRODUCTIVE LIVING, SOCIAL CHANGE, SELF ACTUALIZATION, CULTURAL ACTIVITIES, OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE,

IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT MUCH OF THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION RELFECTS ATTEMPTS, OFTEN MADE IN VAIN, AT SELF-FULFILLMENT IN THE SPHERE OF PAID EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATORS OUGHT TO REASSESS THE WHOLE RANGE AND RATIONALE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR WOMEN. ANALYSIS OF THE BASIC ISSUE OF WOMEN AS INDIVIDUALS AND AS MEMBERS OF SOCIETY STRONGLY SUGGESTS THAT EXISTING EDUCATIONAL PROVISIONS ARE INADEQUATE IN BOTH RESPECTS. MOREOVER, MIDDLE CLASS WORKING WOMEN MAY BE THE FIRST LARGE GROUP DISPLACED BY AUTOMATION, AND WITH THEIR ECONOMIC ROLES BEING ELIMINATED AND THEIR FREE TIME INCREASING, WORKING WOMEN ARE NOW BEING CONFRONTED WITH MANY OF THE PROBLEMS FORESEEN FOR THE AUTOMATED SOCIETY OF THE FUTURE. HOWEVER, ALTERNATIVE LIFE STYLES, BASED ON POLITICS, VOLUNTARY SERVICE, LEARNING AND SCHOLARSHIP, AND APPRECIATION AND SUPPORT OF THE ARTS, COULD BE EVOLVED, AND A RADICALLY NEW TYPE OF SCHOOL OR CURRICULUM COULD BE DEVELOPED WITH THE AIM OF PREPARING AND REEDUCATING WOMEN FOR THEIR CHOSEN LEISURE OCCUPATIONS. (LY)

ED017839

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS 47

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A TURNING TO TAKE NEXT

Alternative Goals in the Education of Women

FREDA H. GOLDMAN

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
at Boston University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY James Whipple

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

AC003171

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL, *Clark University*
JAMES T. CAREY, *University of California*
JOHN P. DYER, *Tulane University*
CYRIL O. HOULE, *University of Chicago*
H. LICHTENSTEIN, *Hofstra College*
JACK LONDON, *University of California*
ERNEST E. MCMAHON, *Rutgers University*
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, *New York University*
ALAN M. THOMAS, *Canadian Association for Adult Education*
CLIFFORD L. WINTERS, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports*, and *Occasional Papers*.

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS *AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY*
138 Mountfort St.
Brookline, Mass. 02146

A TURNING TO TAKE NEXT

Alternative Goals in the Education of Women

FREDA H. GOLDMAN
Staff Associate
Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**
at Boston University

THE CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS** was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. In 1964 CSLEA affiliated with Boston University. The purpose of the Center is to help American higher education institutions develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults.

Copyright 1965 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults at Boston University. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	v
WHY AMERICAN WOMEN WANT TO WORK	1
The Perennial Debate	1
"The Twelve-Pound Look"	4
A Job Is Not Enough	8
WOMEN'S EDUCATION AND THE WORLD OF WORK	12
New Practices	14
Focus on Employment	17
The Problem of Alternatives	19
WORK FOR A LIBERAL LIFE-STYLE	21
The Leisure Complex	21
Occupations in the Liberal Style	23
Varied Styles of Being a Self	28
Politics	29
Voluntary Service	31
"Patron" of Arts	35
"Gentleman-Scholar"	40
SCHOOLING FOR NEW LIFE-STYLES	44
Premises and Plans	44
Bridges to Life-Styles	45
Experimental School: The Montaigne Institute	48
Curriculum	51
Toward Discovery of Self and a "Vocation"	51
Acquiring Experience and a Specialty	53
Building for Continuity	54
ENVOI: FEMINISM RESUMED	55

PREFACE

There is no longer any question that there is a "market" for women's continuing education programs. Those who have tried setting one up have been watching the customers flock in. The response is so spontaneous that the developer of the program can very soon lean back in his chair and contemplate the great service he has rendered womankind.

This book seriously challenges the assumption of many educators that they are successful because they are drawing women so easily into their programs. It challenges the belief that we must get more money, more women enrolled, more programs, no matter what the purpose. It asks the educator to evaluate the whole sprawling field of continuing education as it involves women, and to face up honestly to what is happening in his own particular program.

An adult educator who knows the rate of attrition among his women students will already have become uneasy. But does he really know his student body and how much waste and disillusionment is represented in his dropout rate? Does he know why his women students are there, what they are seeking, what education means to them? Does he know why women are increasingly training to enter paid employment and what other motives are operating to turn mature women toward the colleges?

Mrs. Goldman's discussion provides an incisive analysis of the basic issues concerning women as individuals and as members of today's society. She feels that the same old educational fare, is not adequate to meet fully the needs either of the individual woman or of a changing society. Particularly significant is her concept that middle-class women may be the first large group displaced by a kind of automation. With their economic roles eliminated and with their free time increasing, they are already facing many of the problems which many experts anticipate will be faced by a large proportion of the population in the future.

Certainly many middle class women do not need to work for economic reasons, and many would not plan to work if they could find satisfaction in some other way. Mrs. Goldman explores the needs which these women are trying to satisfy, and which they now feel they can satisfy only through paid employment. In an imaginative section dealing with possible new life styles for women, she demonstrates that alternatives to paid employment can be developed. She also articulates the type of educational program she believes would best develop these alternatives.

For educators the implications of this new approach are profound. It calls upon them to view women in their own worlds, and to create new and unaccustomed ties with various parts of the community in order to foster new life styles and give the support needed to the women who will establish new types of identities.

As a counselor of adult women, I see too many of the disillusioned, too many who have turned naively toward education – any course, any program – as a salvation. Although a hit-or-miss approach may sometimes be valid as a start, it seldom turns out to bring lasting satisfaction. These women have a definite need for focus and direction, particularly in ways which will lead them toward new and unpaid occupations. As a developer of women's programs, I am glad to see Mrs. Goldman insist that it is part of the educator's responsibility to help provide this focus.

Katharine M. Davis
Simmons College

WHY AMERICAN WOMEN WANT TO WORK

The Perennial Debate

Woman's proper place in the scheme of American life became recently once more, a subject of public debate. With less mockery than accompanied the successful attack on "feminism" several decades ago, but with equal intensity, a counter-attack gained force and authority.[1] The present day critics, like their earlier counterparts, talked about a solution to an uneasy question. What pattern of living is right for the modern American woman?

Although perennially raised and answered, the question seems to lose none of its intensity. In fact, so emotionally charged is the subject (at the base of the argument after all is always the issue of the whole relationship between men and women in the society), that as soon as the question is raised, it looses a Pandora's box of paranoid anxiety among both men and women; the spate of words comes fast, and the arguments grow vehement and complicated.[2]

1. In the years right after the war, a biting attack (then labelled "neo-antifeminism") was levelled against the working woman, describing her a "lady in the dark"; whether because of this attack or for other reasons, there followed soon after "a return" to the home and the "feminine way." This adjustment is now being spoofed as a "cult of domesticity" or "the feminine mystique." This subject is discussed further below. But it is not my purpose in this paper to enter the lists on one side or the other. My reason for discussing the role and status of women is only to lay the basis for the educational approach I intend to recommend later.

2. The most recent example is an article in the Harvard Business Review reporting the worried reactions of both men and women to the implications of the federal ruling against discrimination with regard to hiring women for management positions. People interviewed were uneasy about upsetting "woman's place" in society.

Interestingly, however, no matter how diverse and complex the diagnoses, the cures recommended tend to be surprisingly simple, and they use similar arguments in defense of their views: satisfaction and fulfillment for the woman herself, well-being of her children, stability of marriage, and the health of society. At one time and for one side the solution is home (elaborated as a way of life emotional and internal in quality, totally focussed on the family); at another it is work (translated as a way of life intellectual and external in style, in which a job in the world must be part of a woman's life). And no matter how permissive and accepting of divergence the social climate seems to be when the discussions begin, before they have gone very far, pressures tend to build up toward one extreme or the other. In one period, the so-called career woman is put on the defensive; in the other the homemaker must apologize. Today it seems that the feminine salvation pendulum, having rested for a time at the pole of home and family, has swung inexorably to its opposite, employment in the world outside.[3]

That such uncompromising positions should be offered as solutions seems contrary to common sense. Reasonable people find it hard to believe even that a polarity actually exists, and there are always some who insist there are plural possibilities and that women have a free choice. In the case of an individual woman, it is not untrue that intermediate positions between the two poles are possible; some women find the climate permissive enough to be able to live in both worlds or to choose between them comfortably.

But as a rule, especially during periods of active argument, the choice is not really open. When the subject of discussion becomes WOMAN (women viewed as a group) positions taken define one way or the other as the norm (even ideal) for all women. Each position reflects or propounds an assumption about the "natural destiny" of women and about the propriety of her conduct, implying a right way for all that shapes in some way each individual woman's life.

3. This is, of course, true only as a central tendency. A complicating factor always is that in any period, both currents are simultaneously active to a greater or lesser extent, and one woman may find herself caught in both at once, if neighbors and in-laws happen to be on different sides.

An atmosphere is created in the society from which individual women (and growing girls, too) absorb an image of self, a level of aspiration and expectation, a way of relating to significant persons, a certain status in the world of affairs, and numberless other values and attributes. Although the talk may focus on simple alternatives (home, work or both), the choice is actually complicated, involving a woman in a great many subtle decisions. Thus, today, if the pendulum has indeed swung again from home to work, the shift is not a mechanical one. It originated, I believe, in women's dissatisfaction with the totality of the contemporary feminine self-image, and it grew in an effort to grasp the means for upsetting some basic arrangements and to find a way to a new identity and a more satisfactory way of life. That in our present work-centered culture, the emphasis is so single-mindedly set on employment as the way to solve a many-faceted problem, need not make us wonder.[4] And though we do not have to agree that a job is the only valid solution today (as some argue and so many women seem to accept), I do believe we cannot discover appropriate alternatives unless we first understand why women want to work and take that fact fully into account.

For this reason, I begin this exploration of alternative goals in the education of adult women by going quickly over the story of American women (by now fairly familiar to most of us) so that with hindsight we can note what seems to me the central role that work has played in shaping their way of life and in determining their destiny. But after thus providing support for the notion that jobs are a most proper and reasonable, perhaps even inevitable, choice as a means of solving women's underlying difficulty over personal status and general well-being, I propose to go further and to raise the question whether after all in America in the second half of the twentieth century, in the industrial age, in the era of the population explosion, it is also realistic and reliable as a central focus. And, finally, based on this analysis, I want to discuss possible alternative goals for the education of women, programs that would

4. "Americans", according to Florence Kluckholn, "are noted for emphasis on the doing individual as the valued person in our society. Our ideal person is concerned with action and achievement. ... What the individual does and what he can accomplish are primary questions ..." From Jack Weinberg, "Man's Ambivalent Reaction to Automation," Perspective on Automation (Brookline, Mass: CSLEA, 1964), p. 38.

prepare them for roles offering as serious a challenge as work, and appropriate to the mature women ready now, in the second half of the twentieth century, to explore seriously a new occupation.

Why do so many American women who "do not need the money" want to work? One answer may be found by looking at the story of women in earlier periods in this century. I think I should explain, however, that when I speak of "women" I am thinking mainly of the middle-class (also, more often than not, middle-aged) woman who is the likely client of the directors of higher adult education programs, the central audience to whom this paper is addressed. This focus becomes fully evident in the sections on educational programs. But now, too, as we look at background, although I have to talk most of the time about women as though they were a single unit, not distinguishable by class, education, or income, the image in my mind always is this particular section of the feminine population.[5]

"The Twelve-Pound Look"[6]

The question of whether women ought to combine work with housewifeliness is actually quite new. Earlier in our history, social scientists tell us, it was customary for women, in addition to keeping the home and caring for the people in it, to work at economically productive tasks along with men. This was so, social analysts tell us, for American women on the farms and in the pioneer community. Their work, it is true, was home-based, but then so was the men's. When industrialization

5. It is necessary to add, however, that I am not as convinced as some people are that there are essential differences in relation to the questions discussed here between women of different classes. This is not the place to argue the indivisibility of the problem, nor the logic, of which I am convinced, of looking at the middle-class educated woman as the focal point of a general analysis of women's problems. That is a subject for another essay. Let me just say now that in this middle class culture of ours, wherein all social elevators reach to the norms of an educated and prosperous middle class, I think, if we learn to understand and serve the human aspirations of the educated woman, we will find our knowledge useful in coming to terms also with other groups of women. Besides, as a man with whom I work says, if the problems of educated women are dealt with, more women will want to become educated.

6. In a short play with this title, James M. Barrie humorously and sympathetically pictures the aspiration to freedom and self-respect expressed by wives who got the "twelve-pound look," i.e., the desire to learn a skill and get a job.

and the structure of urban life upset these essentially rural arrangements, and home and family took on new forms, men went out of the house to earn a living, but women were expected to stay put. They did this even though their economic jobs were eliminated and even many aspects of their nurturing roles were taken over by specialists and professionals. To fill the hollow places left by these changes in their traditional role, women began to look outside the home for work. And, if we can permit ourselves something of an oversimplification, this is what they have been doing ever since. From the first tentative efforts of the suffragettes, to the present sweep into employment by married women and mothers, the inexorable trend has been from full time concentration in the home, to a division of roles between home and work outside. The climate in which women can work, however, and attitudes toward working women, as we know, have been several times radically revised.[7]

According to recent analyses of the status of women, there have been at least two earlier periods in this century when passions on the subject of women's roles ran high, and in both this relation to work has been a prime distinguishing factor in role adjustment. The first period, the suffragette movement during the early decades of the century, was perhaps the most turbulent of all. But it did break down many legal restrictions on women's freedom to participate in the life of the nation.[8] When the situation settled, it seemed that although the vote was won readily enough, and women came to own, as it was said, the larger part of the nation's wealth, and even double standards in sex practices kept on slackening, the right to jobs, granted verbally, went unsupported by social provision to free women for work or by a willingness to employ her in significant jobs.

7. These changes and their reasons and implications have been widely reviewed in magazines and journals during the recent lively discussions on the status of women. Most readers are already familiar with the facts. But for the sake of those who may not have been following the discussions, it seems worth reviewing quickly the background against which we ought to view the present situation.

8. It is interesting to note that once breached, most legal barriers fell quickly — restrictions to voting and holding property toppled; college doors opened up; even careers became possible. Perhaps "victory" actually came too fast; a need for a harder fight might have forged a leadership and congealed a philosophy. As it was, when opposition came, there was no sure ideology and no mechanism for seeking it.

The only exception – providing a lesson of its own – was a brief period during the Second World War when women were needed in the defense industries. Some of us can remember the nurseries, built then with public funds, to care for the children of women in war work, and the gay approval given to the idea of women in overalls. Women, mothers and all, took man-sized jobs, and held them comfortably.

But at all other times, the woman who wanted to work outside the home has found little help in gaining freedom to do so, and even less support for her personal efforts to make adjustment. Old attitudes and settled customs, never fundamentally challenged, created an underlying discord, and the tensions under which a woman worked were often sharp and perplexing.

Significantly, in the "neo-antifeminist" attack during the forties, it was the career woman against whom the argument was most intense. With biological destiny as the rationale, the working woman was labelled "the lady in the dark." She was warned that if she didn't eschew the intellectural spheres of work and the world of affairs, she would lose her "nature," become in fact unnatural, "a lost sex."[9]

At the time it was raised, this was an effective argument. There was evidence of dislocation in the stories of "career" women recounting their disappointments on psychoanalysts' couches. And social conditions supported the withdrawal of women from the competitive spheres – the depression first, cutting sharply the number of available jobs; and the war later, with its attendant tensions and loneliness breeding, as it seemed, a longing for personal security.

Women who remained at work became troubled by a sense of guilt – afraid they were endangering not only their families but their own identities. Ironically, this was the time when so much was being said about the "many roles of women," and the optimistic picture painted was that a

9. In 1946, Modern Woman: The Lost Sex by Ferdinand Lundberg and Marynia F. Farnham caused as great a commotion as The Feminine Mystique by Betty Friedan did in 1962. Both books came out just in time to sum up a diagnosis and to put a name to an issue that was at a culminating point of public discussion.

woman could choose among an almost infinite number of roles, or combine them if she so desired.[10]

But the facts of life soon convinced women they could not simply combine work and home. However many statements skirted the issue, the choice they had was quite clear: if a woman avoided significant external roles (especially in work spheres competitive with men), if she turned her sights exclusively inward to the home and to the household, a woman was promised emotional security, sexual satisfaction, and fulfillment of her "feminine destiny." If she went to work it was at the risk of destroying her marriage, her children's mental health, and her own femininity.

Maybe it was because the new image of domestic bliss was at least concrete, a relief from the many roles presumably, but not really, available, that it took such firm hold. Daughters of women who had taken careers for granted, some critics now tell us, dropped out of school, married early, had many children, and used whatever talents they possessed in advancing the affairs of husband and children. They looked to find fulfillment through vicarious living, in appreciating passively what others – husband and children – were doing, not asking what they themselves could do or be.[11]

In any case, that's how the picture seemed if you looked only at college women and professional jobs. At the lower end of the employment ladder, less well-educated women persisted in getting jobs, and statistics on the entry of women into the labor force continued to mount. Those who <u>needed</u> to earn a living found they could combine home and a job, especially if they stuck to low level, or sex-related jobs, non-competitive with men. And some educated women, who found the home not

10. As we look back now it is easy to see how rigid the attitudes were, but at the time few of us questioned the validity of the existence of many possible roles. Maybe that is why I do not put much stock in the assurances we hear about plural role possibilities now. In theory women have always had choices. In fact, their choices have always been severely circumscribed by the social climate.

11. Whereas wives of the earlier generation had used Eleanor Roosevelt as the ideal image – a fully functioning human being in her own right – the ideal wife of the later period tended to be the corporation wife, the "partner" (Mamie Eisenhower, for example) who found realization through her husband's career.

rich enough to provide a full existence, also refused to yield to the propaganda. And since reality can sometimes change attitudes, we've seen recently clear signs of a loosening of the strictures against working women (even if they are mothers). A surprising amount of new research data is coming out supporting the notion that women can work without endangering the mental health of their children or the foundations of their marriages.[12] Moreover, in the aftermath of Sputnik, and in the era of the new Negro revolt, it became clear that women's "talents," too, could not be allowed to run to waste.[13]

And this, in part, was the situation when recently the question of women's role in American life was again raised, and women brought forth once more their sense of grievance at being shut out of the mainstream of affairs.

And while I will not insist on this work-centered view of women's problems, I am convinced that there is enough validity in it, so that, if we wish to know for what to educate women today, we must first understand the meaning of work for her and for the society in our time.

A Job Is Not Enough

I want to elaborate somewhat this point which to me seems so important. I am contending that if we look deep into the eye of the hurricane of talk about women's destiny in our country, no matter when it has risen to the present high intensity, one fact seems to stand out; participation in paid work has been a significant measure of women's freedom and status as it is for all members of the society. The sphere of work is the center within which honor and position are won. The "trouble with women" is that in a changing society, early in this century, they lost important segments of their traditional job and they have been trying, for the most part vainly, to find substitutes to fill the resultant vacuum of unfilled time and unrealized potential.

12. The Employed Mother in America by F. Ivan Nye and Lois W. Hoffman is a collection of study reports on working mothers many of which support the notion that children do not suffer if the mother works.

13. Difficult times do not encourage the coddling of women. In the severe competition of the cold war, as in a real war, a "cult of domesticity" has to go and women need to be "drafted" into the work pool along with men.

Even those who idealize the traditional home role recognize this state of things indirectly. They talk of the homemaker's role as a full time job; with eloquence they tack on to present day homemaking the qualities and values that were related to the more productive operations of the housewife of an earlier era. They fill in the vacuum left by the loss of the economic duties by amplifying a woman's responsibilities for interpersonal relations.

That this formula is now being rejected as a "cult" or a "mystique" is evidence that the attempt at transformation proved hollow. The home today does not provide women with the opportunity for self-realization as "work" is expected to do; it is a milieu not now rich enough with opportunities for a total existence. Some women are acutely conscious of this inadequacy, even in the busy child raising years; but the feeling of emptiness hits the majority of women most sharply in the middle years when the children are at school.

In this work-valuing culture, where most socially significant roles are found only within a vocation or by way of the professional route, occupations that satisfactorily replace economically productive work as a cornerstone of existence are not easy to find. None of the palliatives — neither volunteer community service nor courses in psychology or world affairs; neither painting nor golf-playing; neither PTA nor garden club — if the stories now being told by women are even only half true, could provide in adequate measure the satisfactions that attend a job in our society. To be "out of work" has meant to be left out of the mainstream of life.

That is why jobs have come to seem <u>the</u> solution to the personal problems of women, and today most writers and speakers argue for work training for women. But the trouble is that this solution does not face up to all the difficulties. Jobs for <u>all</u> women as a reforming slogan is just too self-limiting a solution for a complicated problem in a most complex age. Many people reject the whole notion of serving women's special needs simply because they believe this conclusion, so narrow and so "radical," is taking undue sway over all others.

Even if we accept the fact that all women want to work (as I implied earlier and shall elaborate in a little while, I don't believe it is a job that women are seeking so much as it is a personally meaningful occupation

that can give them a chance to use their talents and to explore their potential). As a cure-all for women's present ills, a job is suspect on many grounds. To many women, for instance, it will be a solution simply unacceptable – old customs and attitudes among women as well as men in some sections of the population, persist to oppose careers for many women. For others it is irrelevant – for most mature women, the clients of adult education, significant careers are really not a live option. Good jobs are just not accessible to them. Most women in middle age who try to "go back" to work find themselves taking any little job that comes their way in the belief that this will give meaning to their life. The jobs they can get do not provide the creative outlet they are actually seeking.

But most important of all, as a solution it is probably already out of date, made obsolete by new social forces – automation and population increases, for example – which at least open the question of the availability of employment for all.[13]

A cultural lag, the survival of the rural image in a society transformed into an urban culture, in past decades made finding substitutes for economic work almost impossible for women, since the image restricted them to the home. We must be wary that in counseling women today to look for fulfillment only in jobs, we are not actually victims of a new lag – a failure to catch up with new transformations in our way of life. The fact is that technological changes (and their consequences in social rearrangements) have not merely eliminated the hard core of housewives' jobs; they threaten the work satisfaction potential in many other work areas. In the context of life in the 1960's with industrialization accelerating, with the expansion of leisure time a fact for all, with a population explosion ready to place into the market armies of young workers, the solutions for lack of human satisfaction in one's life cannot continue to be exclusively to take a job or to go back to school for professional training. Even if the statistics predicting the drastic changes

13. A writer in Nation last year even hinted darkly that quite to the contrary, the back to work movement among women is a "plot" by employers to create a flexible and cheap labor supply in the new conditions being created by automation. Recently, Margaret Mead, in an informal discussion, said something similar. Women she felt were not really getting ahead very much; they were just being used as the last cheap educated labor supply.

in work needs don't impress us, there is enough reason in the changing nature of the society to make us pause before settling for producing no other really serious alternatives.

It is possible to say of women that, in a sense, they are in the forefront of "workers dis-employed" by the technological revolution, the first "automated" group in our society to confront that strange and disquieting new freedom we call leisure. The way they learn to find personal fulfillment and self-respect in their "leisure society" can point the direction for the way we go about solving the problem when and if it touches us all. This is the challenge I think we have to keep in mind as we turn now to look briefly at the present patterns in adult education for women, as a prelude to developing further the idea of new kinds of "work" for women.

WOMEN'S EDUCATION AND THE WORLD OF WORK

In his survey of American colleges, Sanford says that career preparation is the rock on which higher education in this country is built.[1] It is not surprising, therefore, that the colleges have reacted so little to the complex problem women brought with them when they came to the universities. That the freedom to get a higher education might not include the freedom (psychological and social, if not legal) to enter a significant career was not acknowledged or even recognized in the professionally-oriented colleges and universities. Thus, during the transforming periods in women's roles mentioned earlier, the education of women – especially in the colleges – proceeded until very recently without much change. In consequence of the feminist emancipation movement, colleges opened their doors to women, and in true democratic spirit, gave them the same career-directed curriculum they gave men. And this most of them continued to do even when double roles for women were being quite openly discouraged and abandoned. To the few college presidents who tried to consider the question of goals, of the kind of life to which women were going from school, the changing mood suggested only two varieties of adaptation (according to Sanford): " . . . either a very narrow or specialized curriculum (institutional dietetics, adolescent women's physical education) or a very broad unfocussed potpouri of the liberal arts ... "

In light of the social situation, it is not surprising that few women in recent years found much use for either form of education. Of those who went through the traditional curricula, few finished college and fewer still went on to graduate schools. Neither they, nor their counterparts who got a "feminine" curriculum, achieved significant posts in politics

1. R. Nevitt Sanford, American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962).

or in business.[2] As volunteers they took their training to service agencies but since most social services had long been fully professionalized, they found there too no real opportunity for using either their talents or their education.

Among educators, and in the public too, both forms of education were often criticized. The regular curricula, it was said, gave women "too wide a view"; they developed broad interests which were later frustrated. Most important, it was said, the colleges exposed women to masculine values and purposes so that when they were in the home, they felt their usefulness challenged. On the other hand, the specialized curricula were criticized as anti-intellectual on the one hand, or dilettante on the other.

In adult education (the area of our concern here), to which women have flocked in ever larger numbers over the years (in liberal studies they sometimes outnumber men two to one), the programs of study which were available tended to be random in form, and undirected and inconsequential as far as affecting their actual lives was concerned.[3]

In recent years, as part of the general re-examination of women's roles in society (perhaps actually sparking it), a new turn in thinking about the education of women has had a sharp impact on educational thought and especially on adult education. A feeling of society's having failed to meet women's (and thus also its own) actual needs gave impetus to efforts to find more suitable educational approaches. Educators applied will and energy to the development of special programs for women, with a particular concern for the mature woman.

2. Statistical reports now quoted indicate that women early made progress in winning places as judges, business executives, college teachers, a momentum which has since been lost. The figures on college teaching are interesting: in 1930, 30 percent of college faculties were women, but by 1962 it was only about 22 percent — and this, in spite of the fact that actually more women go to college today.

3. Public Leadership quotes a study showing that although women made up 52 percent of the participants in programs of civic and public affairs, they play only a very minor role in local or national affairs.
Wendell Bell, Richard J. Hill, Charles R. Wright, Public Leadership, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1961, 55.

Since about 1960, therefore, a new kind of program for mature women has been appearing on some university calendars. The fact that they are designated as "Programs for Women" is in itself possibly the most striking difference between them and all former courses. This effort to focus fully on the problems of this particular group, after close examination of its history, experience, and present concerns, released imagination and energy not only among educators but among social thinkers in the public. The recent furor concerning women's status in the society was an effect as well as a cause of the new interest in women as a special educational challenge. Among the early writers in the recent discussions of women's special needs were educators of women (Esther Raushenbush of Sarah Lawrence, Mary Bunting of Radcliffe, Pauline Tompkins of the American Association of University Women), reacting to needs revealed to them by the women under their care.

The new programs vary considerably among themselves, but in general they tend to introduce similar innovations in both goals and methods. In light of the social emphasis on the importance of work, it is not surprising that the new goals are so very highly work-related. Rationales speak repeatedly of the need to return to the labor pool women with ability and with potentiality for contributing to the society; and on a more personal note, of helping women individually to find work outside their homes in an effort to enlarge life's boundaries. Thus, the new special women's programs, unlike previous programs, are seriously goal-directed, demanding a sustained and rigorous effort – even if they offer only the so-called personal enrichment program. Many are fully conceived programs of educational rehabilitation with the objective of drawing women back into serious academic endeavor toward a degree and into careers. A few try to help women enter "masculine" work spheres such as mathematics and science or university teaching, but most are still mainly in the traditional areas reserved for women – public school teaching, nursing, social work, and library science.

New Practices

But whatever the goal (and we will have to return to the question of goals again later), a major factor in most new programs is the effort to make necessary adjustments in the conditions of study to fit the needs of the women students. Some of the adaptations being attempted are the same ones sought generally in forward looking programs for all adults –

opportunity for part-time study, for accelerating the educational process, for independent study, etc. But others seek to introduce some new twists especially needed by women: day-time hours, fewer restrictions on the transfer of credit (wives frequently mobile because of their husbands' careers, must often interrupt their own educational plans), child care arrangements to free women during the child-rearing years, and so on.

In each of the better known of the new programs, there is some breakthrough in one or more of the restrictive factors that keep women out of the work or study sphere. It is worth looking at some of these programs,[4] and at the changes they introduce, for each has helped to prepare a climate and a method in women's education that enhances the chance of success for those of us who want to go on to further experimentation.

In any discussion of special programs for women, the Minnesota Plan ought to be among the first mentioned. It was one of the earliest (1959) of the new programs, and because of the wide publicity it received, its influence has been widespread. One innovation in this program was the very idea of a "plan" especially for women, offered by a university, as a distinct, identifiable activity within its halls. Another innovation was the notion of an educational time-table adjusted to suit women's life cycle. The program's architects reasoned that women can't go a straight school-to-career way through college, to graduate school, and ultimately to jobs as most men do. They may need to break this educational time-table in order to complete an education in stages natural to their pattern of life. Women interrupt schooling to marry, to raise a family, to put a husband through school, to move with him to a new city. In language almost too vivid for comfort, the Minnesota plan provides for three adjustment processes they call "rust prevention" (programs for women during the child-raising years), "derusting" (easing the way "back"), and

4. It is not my purpose here to present a complete summary of current programs for women, but only to point out some new departures. Those who want general data will find that there are many sources, among among them: C. K. Grant, "Centers for Continuing Education. A Summary" (Pembroke Alumna, January, 1964), and "Draft Summary of Programs for Women at other Institutions", an unpublished report of the Committee on the Education of Women at the University of Washington, Seattle.

"rust-proofing" (guiding undergraduate women students to make a "life plan").

The Minnesota program contributed to the thinking about women's education more than the notion of women's different life stages; it also stressed the need for greater seriousness of purpose (rigorous seminars replaced casual or scattered courses), for finding ways to help women move into the conventional university programs leading to a degree, and most important of all, for providing vocational and personal as well as educational counseling.

This emphasis on counseling is perhaps the most important of all the new features in the educational programs designed especially for women. Going much beyond simple educational advice long term counseling has become a necessary part of most of the women's programs, to help women who wish to "go back" (i.e., leave the single-minded concentration on home and get involved deeply in the world of work) to find their way in the maze of cloudy possibilities. For, while interest among women in a "second chance" is very high, it is also fairly diffuse. Most mature women who contemplate a return to school don't know what they want to do with their lives; they feel a need to change but toward what new goal is not clear.

Almost all of the important programs being offered to women today found it necessary to make a serious commitment to counseling.[5] Minneapolis is only one among many universities that provide some form of counseling. Others with well developed programs are Syracuse University, Radcliffe Institute, Sarah Lawrence College, the University of Wisconsin, Northeastern University, University of Oregon and others. In the Discovery program at Roosevelt University in Chicago, it is the central element (as, according to present plans, it is expected to be also at Oakland University in Michigan).

From Radcliffe's Institute for Independent Study came a contribution to the new movement for women's education in still another form. Substantial fellowship grants were awarded to women of clear promise to

5. How popular counseling is as an ingredient of women's programs is reflected also in an institute (Summer, 1965) sponsored by the American Association of University Women — an eight-week course to train counselors of adult women.

pursue a creative, academic, or artistic interest. Time, a place to work, a library, a laboratory were only part of the gift made to talented women through these awards. Perhaps as significant was the companionship of peers, at the Institute's headquarters, a pleasant home-style ivory tower where scholars are assigned offices to work if they need them, and all gather more or less regularly, at meetings with each other, with members of the staff, and with visitors from the public for formal and informal conversations. The Institute's main contribution, I tend to feel, is its understanding of the need to provide support and recognition as well as financial aid to help bring to fruition a creative impulse which in the normal round of life (outside the professions) had before found no room. Although too special in its potential audience, and too expensive to be widely imitated, this program nonetheless pointed up, to the new movement for women's education, a sense of scope and possibility of attainment personally achieved, outside the rigid structure of formal institutions.

Another "pioneer" in the field, Sarah Lawrence College, confronted directly still another problem and focused attention on it. A plan was developed to help women "drop-outs" return to college to complete preparation for a degree. To women with at least one year of college completed, Sarah Lawrence College offered help (guidance and re-orientation) in getting back to school and into academic work. Subsequently, Sarah Lawrence College increased its continuing education program to include also a program offering a master's degree in social work (with New York University) and in elementary teaching for women who wished to complete professional training in these areas.

Focus on Employment

These new features notwithstanding, in most programs, although rationales express concern for preparing women for voluntary as well as paid roles, and even for pure personal development, the central new emphasis is the back-to-work goal. The end to be achieved through most of the new programs is a job — a fact simply acknowledged in the training programs, but implied also in the degree-directed programs. All the programs mentioned above (with the possible exception of Radcliffe's which is so special that it cannot be neatly classified) give at least some support to the idea that the ultimate goal is a job. And here are just a

few other examples of the help today being offered to women who wish to go back to work.

The American Association of University Women has for many years made available substantial fellowships to women who are willing to go back to school to qualify for college teaching in an effort to reverse the trend of a declining feminine role in higher education. In 1964, the Danforth Foundation announced a similar program of fellowships for women who plan a serious career in the field of higher education. Rutgers University (with help from the Ford Foundation) has for many years been giving women a special opportunity to train for careers in mathematics. In the New York area, the Seven College Workshop (also supported by a grant from Carnegie), is designed to give women an opportunity to get help in finding out where to go and what to aim for if they want to return to work. Hofstra College is training research assistants; Syracuse University just announced a training program for social work aids; and innumerable others are preparing teachers. And all the afore-mentioned counseling centers are in large part also vocational guidance services.

Helping along the back-to-work goal is the growing opportunity for part-time degree-directed study. Most women's programs recognize the need to make some provision for a part-time schedule, and the "special" degree programs for adults[6] (at Goddard College, Brooklyn College, Oklahoma University, to name only three of a growing group of such programs) are all generally part time. But at Simmons College in Boston it is now possible to complete an undergraduate degree on a part-time basis in the daytime. And Catalyst, a private agency, especially created to serve women nationally, has made part-time study (and work) opportunity its major focus; it is committed to discovering, and getting others to discover, opportunities for part-time study for women in all parts of the country, to ease the way for their eventual return to work.

Finally, making the role call for work almost unanimous, the President's Commission on the Education of Women, also focused on the need to retrain women for work. Among its recommendations were two, which

6. Degree programs especially for adults are a recent adult education development in an effort to modify the regular undergraduate credit-for-time in school requirement for a degree. The programs provide for independent study, credit for experience, advanced placement, and other features to ease the rigid requirements for a college degree.

if followed as a national policy, would have a sharp impact on this aspect of women's lives – the establishment of public child-care centers and the provision of guidance and counseling as well as opportunities for re-education to help women return to work.

And, as mentioned earlier, a more concerted effort by social thinkers and research scientists to study the question is helping to erase formerly throttling myths and to make a double role for women, even mothers, acceptable as well as desirable among significant portions of the society.

The Problem of Alternatives

Not everyone, of course, is equally satisfied with this emphasis on vocational and professional training. Some educators resist the approach as incompatible with women's desire or need. But their response makes little impression, partly because the present mood is unreceptive to compromise, but mostly because they are not offering any concrete alternatives similarly based on a realistic estimate of the role of work in women's lives or of their demands at the present time. For the usual traditional reasons, or because they tend to dismiss the turmoil as just so much female fret and fuss, these educators merely reschedule the venerable courses and programs (cultural and liberal) they have been offering women for nearly a generation, making no special effort to meet women's need to find significant out-of-home roles.

As things stand today, if you look behind the grand things being said to the activities actually offered to women, you find, where any notice at all is taken of women's education as a special area, that offerings with very few exceptions are in two main categories: either clearly career (or degree) oriented; or the old fare, served à la mode – world affairs, art appreciation, child psychology, etc., with some new twists (a daytime schedule, "rigor," baby-sitter service, a head of Minerva on a brochure of announcement, etc.).

Based realistically on current societal values and university practices, and on an understanding of the role of work in women's lives, the back-to-work motif has struck the dominant note. The woman who finds the home role not enough for a full life, or who wishes to find new scope for her talents and interests, sees few serious alternatives to the job-oriented programs. Job-training programs are over-enrolled even if the

job involved is such a routinely feminine one as nursing, and vocational guidance centers are swamped with clients. At this moment women do not want to hear the words of caution from those who are convinced that a job may not solve their problems. Seeking significant occupations, longing for a new identity, women see only the world of work as offering either. Educators who offer liberal education to prepare for citizenship or community service or education itself as a way of life (in place of work) fail to make a case for their product. To these female veterans of adult liberal programs and voluntary service they have not convincingly explained how the education they offer today can lead to non-job roles more satisfying than the ones they have experienced in the past and are now rejecting.

Nonetheless, I am convinced that it is possible to find satisfying "work" in the society for women outside the employment sphere, and that we must do so because the focus on jobs alone is not an adequate response to the whole situation. There are difficulties, of course, and we have to be prepared to deal with them. In the next section I want to take note of these as a prelude to discussing what action we might take.

WORK FOR A LIBERAL LIFE-STYLE

Without posing a "to work or not to work" opposition, I would say that liberal educators of women today have a responsibility to try to develop programs that can compete in the pervasive professionalism of the society, because they lead to alternative kinds of work (not jobs) that can win serious respect.

The problem is that this kind of "work" is traditionally identified with leisure, and it is the leisure-time activities that I have said all along women have explored and found wanting. At first glance this appears a true dilemma. But at a closer look it seems possible that it is only an impasse created by our ambivalence about leisure, which has meant that we have never really attempted to face the issues it raises or to investigate seriously the possibilities it contains for providing meaningful activity.

The Leisure Complex

We don't understand leisure; it is unfamiliar to us; we are afraid of it. There is reluctance even to use the word. Instead of talking about "leisure" or "leisure pursuits," writers talk of "dis-employment" and of "non-work," as though the word "leisure" were somehow suspect, not quite respectable; they seem afraid that it connotes only idleness, frivolity, waste. But leisure actually has classically a most honorable meaning for which there is no substitute word – that condition of life when labor for survival is completed or not necessary, and there is time for a man to devote himself to the cultivation of the humanistic virtues, to engage in the liberal pursuits of the freeman: aesthetics, politics, contemplation, even pleasure. It is, I trust, obvious in what follows that when I use the word leisure, it is with this latter meaning in mind.

Our prejudice against the idea of leisure has burdened us with attitudes and judgments at odds with common sense. There are social critics, for instance, who simply deny the existence of leisure. One has only

to look around, they say, to know that leisure is an illusion. There is no evidence of leisure living. On the contrary, these critics point out, everyone is working; or if he has some free time, he is busy looking for a job – a second one if he already has one. As a matter of fact, people are busier than they have ever been before. Thus, there is no reason they conclude to worry at all about "leisure work." Other writers accept the "new leisure" as a fact, but simply deny it presents a problem. They too are impatient with those who worry about free time. They write about all the grand free (unspecified) occupations that anyone with sense ought to be happy to do. If they weren't so busy themselves, these writers insist, they would like nothing better than to devote their own lives to such pursuits. As it is, they recommend them to their wives or their retired parents.

Both of these views are, I think, self-deluding. The first one simply ignores the facts. In the face of a short work week, early retirement patterns, a skyrocketing entertainment industry, and a thirteen-week sabbatical for steelworkers, it is hard to see how they can hold to the position that there is no such thing as leisure. We know there are people with "leisure" time heavy on their hands. Women are not the only ones who have complained about losing their "jobs"; most workers today are busy only part of their time, and for only part of their lives. The truth is that those forced into a life of leisure are out of sight of the writers and commentators, quite invisible, like Michael Harrington's poor, and just as "unemployed." This is actually the problem along women secluded in suburban "retirement." Their empty time is covered up by stratagems of their own or of the society's invention, but it remains a canker — Betty Friedan's "problem without a name" that is driving women, in the absence of genuine or satisfying occupations of leisure, to look for a job.

Similarly, those who assure people that it is easy to use well each shining leisure hour delude us with false promises. There are no happy leisure occupations just waiting around if, and ultimately when, one becomes "disemployed." Leisure occupations did once exist. In the Greek city-state, they were the ideal work for free citizens; the American founding fathers found leisure occupations at hand; and "Lady Bountiful" and Marcenas did indeed have "jobs" to do in their leisure lives. But these honorable pursuits, available to women and men with leisure in other eras, faded away as work values became more and more the domi-

nant values in the modern industrial (democratic and puritan) culture, and almost all occupations of any kind were professionalized.

Today, whatever of these significant occupations of leisure (i.e., unpaid but necessary work) there are, are awards to those deep in a career. A lawyer or a businessman can with honor become a dollar-a-year man or run for public office; a corporation head can become board chairman of a health clinic or of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. But those outside the career sphere are also outside the world of affairs. In their world there are no seriously taken occupations of leisure.

Not only to solve the problem for women or retired persons, but for the sake of the whole changing world in which we live, we ought to stop talking in generalities and face seriously the question of leisure, systematically tackling the problem of defining or creating respected leisure roles in forms suited to our culture, and accessible to our people with leisure. We ought to try to find out if we can rescue the classical leisure occupations from their shadowy state, revitalize them for present day use, or use them as analogs for new models we invent.

My specific interest in such a venture is based on my belief that seriously conceived occupations of leisure can help to solve many women's present problems. I would like to try to discover whether the historical leisure roles that once worked for aristocrats (the founding fathers, et al) can be reconstructed for modern women of the middle class, and to see if it is possible to re-educate grown-up women to acquire the capabilities and attitudes for a style of life usually the accumulated product of a lifetime of experience. The rest of this paper is an effort to suggest an approach to doing this. As I develop my approach, I do not expect to resolve the natural doubts that are sure to arise over a speculative effort. But whether we believe we can succeed or not, we have to take the chance. Adult liberal education has never been faced with so clear a challenge; no task has ever been so exactly tailor-made for continuing liberal education.

Occupations in the Liberal Style

I shall try to do three things. I want to identify and examine in terms of their present relevance some of the occupations that have traditionally lain outside the economic competitive world, and that seem po-

tentially capable even today of yielding a full measure of life satisfaction. I want also to discuss what seems to me a necessary style for practicing the occupations, if as liberal occupations of leisure, they are also to be respected in a work culture, and not merely seen as busy work to fill idle hours. And, finally, I want to suggest my concept of the kind of education that is necessary to train and give explicit support to those women who want to try out these leisure roles.

Let me put off for the time being what must be a rather fanciful task of making a start toward "rediscovering" the leisure occupations of our forefathers. Later I want to try this exercise, to describe how in my opinion some of the classic roles, once aristocratic in nature, seem now to beckon us and to promise models for our day. But first, I want to look at the far more difficult and more crucial question of style. In finding occupations for people in a leisure context, it is not enough, as I have insisted before, to find something to do; in this day and with our social attitudes and values, what is done has to be of a quality that gives it a central place in our regard similar to the place a job now holds. If the occupations of leisure are to work as alternatives to paid jobs they must be practiced in a way that can shape a style of life.

The word "style" is not easy to define, and yet it is central to my point. Let me see if I can explain it operationally. In the lives of the founding fathers, the leisure occupations – politics, scholarships, service – were the basis of their leisure style of life, in the same way that a career (or even a job) today serves as the basis of the work style. There was a total commitment to a line of work, the leisure occupation (even if that occupation was solely contemplative), in somewhat the same way that the work-style in our day involves a commitment to a career. A leisure-style today must, I believe, involve a similar wholehearted commitment to an occupation of leisure. In other words, the qualities of paid work (the so-called virtues of work) must characterize also the leisure occupation. If, as seems likely, such virtues are not automatically present in the leisure pursuits we define for our project, they must be injected deliberately, built into the situation.

The style-setting pattern is a formula based on combining the elements in work that give it its virtue, in balance with the values inherent in the nature of the leisure occupations themselves.

Exactly what features make work so valuable to us that even routine jobs are often elevated to a style of life we still don't know. Scientists must enlarge their research efforts on this problem and help us to identify the specific human needs that work satisfies. In the meantime, however, as educators, we can try to copy the few things we do know about the rewards of work.

Certainly we know that one highly valued feature in the work style is doing something to which one is solidly committed (if not by virtue of intensive dedication, at least because it provides a livelihood). Secondly, the job to which one is committed seems to define him – is his source of identity. And there is also recognition – some overt assurance (in the case of paid jobs, the money actually being paid) that the work is useful and necessary and is recognized as valuable if not by all the world, at least by the person himself and a significant "neighborhood."

And in addition to these two major elements – the commitment to something the world wants or needs to be done, and gaining a sense of identity and recognition thereby–there are other values attending the work style in our society that our practice of occupations in the leisure-style should offer – talent use, for example, a bulwark against loneliness a way of adding variety to the day, a medium through which to affect the environment.

But the central satisfying quality, summing up all others, is commitment. Thus, while we ought to try to encompass all the work virtues we can in our leisure occupations, we must, if the occupations are to be seriously competitive with employment, at least make certain that the roles we offer women are of such a nature that they will win commitment without the extrinsic reward of a pay envelope.

If we can accomplish this, then along with the pay check we can reject the burdensome aspect of work and enjoy also the qualities of leisure which can add another exciting dimension to the leisure style of living. A leisure occupation need not be a "job." In fact, it cannot be, for an occupation that can win commitment without pay has to be different in kind (of a high quality) as well as in form. Moreover, it would be absurd to duplicate the career wheel, to carry over into leisure needlessly the enslaving limitations of the work-role. In finding leisure work, for instance, women can be quite "choosy" about the work they undertake,

picking "jobs" not by chance, but rather on the basis of their own deep convictions. Neither do they need to allow themselves to be "adjusted" to prescribed tasks; they can instead adapt jobs to their own talents and wishes. Furthermore, they can pitch the "work" at a more humane pace, be more generous to the spirit, more relaxed about "getting somewhere." People engaged in leisure occupations can afford to take "time to stand and stare," not to measure it wasted time because they stop to think or prepare or plan or just look around before taking up the task; they can "indulge" themselves with periods of reflection and study before going to work (or along with work), or they can change from occupations that cease to satisfy a need or themselves. Such good things, the world of organized work has no time for any more, even in the intellectual jobs, but we want to make sure we don't cheat women of them while trying to retain the virtues of work.

On the other hand, of course, we will have to be careful not to undermine the concept of leisure occupations by confusing them with standard notions of part-time jobs. The practice of an occupation of leisure, even if it is not full-time (what is full-time these days anyway?) involves a full-time job psychology. A part-time job implies a part-time commitment – of time, thought, value. It is a filler-in, a less than fully serious undertaking. A leisure occupation as here defined requires an acceptance of full responsibility, a commitment with a high imperative.

But ultimately part-time or full-time is not the issue – any more than is the amateur (unpaid) or professional (paid) standing of the occupation. The difference is the style. If the occupation is not merely something added on to what is already a fixed life pattern, but rather a reshuffling of the pattern itself, reordering other components of life, affecting a change in the way we relate to the world and to each other, to what we commit our energies, psychic and physical, it can set a life-style. A life-style involves a posture, a way of self-identification, a scale of what is seen as most worth-while. The leisure occupation that underlies the style is chosen with care, prepared for vigorously, practiced with love, and viewed as a form of pleasure, and as a source of meaning. Or to put it more practically, we can summarize the essential ingredients as follows:

1. The occupation involves doing something that can be named – it is an occupation that can carry an identity with it.

2. Either because it affects the environment or because it has been recognized by the woman herself as meaningful, it has enough significance to the individual and the society to be worthy of commitment.
3. The preparation made is thorough and intensive – to become excellent amateurs is the goal, "workers" as carefully prepared as those who engage in a career.
4. It has intrinsic virtues offering adventure, fun, freedom, friendship.
5. Because it is all of the above, the occupation can be practiced in a way to shape a style of life.

Does all this necessarily mean one vocation only that totally absorbs? I don't think so. Certainly, within the large occupational categories, changing from one focus to another ought to be possible. But it ought to be possible also in a lifetime, to engage in what Montaigne once described as "... varied explorations of innumerable styles of being a self...." In our complex culture, we simply assume that all socially useful tasks are highly specialized, requiring almost lifetime specialists as performers. But look how many ways Winston Churchill found to be useful. In the Boston Globe (January 31, 1965), Max Freedman described his varied activities as follows:

> He moved from politics to painting, from oratory to the writing of history, from the excitements of conversation to the consolations of reading. Variety gave him strength and prevented the weariness that comes from one task too long continued. And his life foamed and glittered almost to the last moment.

But are the styles of life possible for Montaigne or Churchill or the "founding fathers" – aristocrats all – really accessible and capable of yielding satisfaction to our essentially middle-class women? That is certainly an open question. But so is our simple reliance on the work-style to suit all of us at all times of life in today's mechanized society. Women today may be closer to aristocracy than we think. Our affluent society, we are often told these days, provides more goods and leisure to larger portions of the middle classes (the "comfort classes" a new book on culture calls them) than were available to our aristocratic ancestors.

There is a difference of course, in every meaningful sense, and it is one sure reason why educators must step into the picture. Unlike our ancestors, we do not learn attitudes and skills of leisure-style living at our mother's knee; nor does our society provide support for this way of

life. Montaigne's and even Churchill's enormous advantage was that they were to the style born, and the society had a place for them. It is probably not entirely possible for adults to overcome the handicap of a "disadvantaged" (for leisure living) background and environment. Ultimately, it will remain for a new generation to know how to live easily in a leisure style. But they too will need the models, even if only partially successful, we can create now, so they may have some reality to pattern after and to identify them. Let me turn, therefore, now to the subject I set aside earlier; the identification of leisure occupations to form the basis of the new styles of life that may be made usable today.

Varied Styles of Being A Self

Compounding fact and a little fancy, I can imagine at least four kinds of occupations that can form the basis of a leisure life-style. Each offers exciting possibilities for rich living, either as a full-time role and lifetime job, or as a bright temporary strain sharing a lifetime with careers, housewifery, or with each other. The challenge is to make them really accessible – not only outwardly practiceable, but able to provide the sense of meaning to life that I believe women really seek today when they go out to look for a job.

We know these occupations by name; as careers or as time-fillers we have had some experience with them. They are unfamiliar to us only as serious leisure pursuits.[2] Let me name them first and then in turn discuss their meaning and their present relevance as occupations of leisure that can be elevated to a style of life.

First is the political life-style, the occupation of which is politics and the symbolic model for which is the "founding fathers." Second is the voluntary service life-style with social work as the occupation and "Lady Bountiful" as the symbolic model. Third is the patron of arts life-style; the occupation is appreciation and support of the on-going arts; and the symbolic model is Maecenas. And last is the contemplative life style, the occupation is learning; and the symbolic model is the "gentleman scholar". All of these need elaboration.

2. Actually I believe, even as activities of leisure, these exist in embryonic form; in the program I suggest later for exploring life-styles, one of the first tasks is to search the society for models, partial or complete, of such styles of life now successfully pursued.

Politics: The Style of the Founding Fathers

Very much Renaissance men, generalists certainly, capable of doing many things, the American founding fathers yet found their life's meaning in shaping a society. They lived, in every sense, the political lifestyle. The central occupation in this leisure style is politics, defined quite specifically as activity related to governing the state; it is concerned with influencing and affecting the political affairs of the locality and the nation.

Only a few women today are engaged in politics. In fact, the number is so small it makes a mockery of the equal rights they won not so very long ago. The society suffers too. Concentration of power in any segment of the population is not only against our ideal but fails to meet present necessities. The country needs women to add their portion of talent and those so-called feminine insights to the public sphere – peace-mindedness, human sympathy, an aesthetic bias. That is one reason why politics is first on my list of leisure occupations for women.

But I put it first also because, more than any other style, it participates in the virtues of work, providing an arena in which commitment is necessary and can be freely given with assurance of personal rewards. If one is in politics, one does not have to have a job to be taken seriously. Politics is respected (even though it is sometimes called amoral), for it affects the sphere where power resides. It is, moreover, exciting and challenging, engaging talents and training as well as qualities of character. It is a satisfying way of life, and for women, as for all out-groups, it is a natural field within which to work for equality, and to win honor and a sense of personal worth.

There is still another reason why I put politics first. The society needs people with leisure in politics, people with great blocks of time for study as well as action. Political power ought to be reserved for people who can approach it thus responsibly. Maybe that is why it has so often been an aristocrat's role. Women (on the assumption that they have time to study and to do) ought to be among today's aristocrats and devote themselves to politics as a way of life.

But how unrealistic is it to expect women to carve out political lives when we know they have made so poor a showing so far? Men in public life today seem to feel it is possible and certainly necessary to involve

women in affairs of state. President Johnson has been talking about breaking the masculine monopoly and making a special effort to get women into the political life of the country; even the Pope invited a woman or two to the Church's main political event–the Ecumenical Council. But neither Johnson nor the Pope will get very far unless women can be helped to overcome their own fears or reluctance. They can produce "token women" like "token Negroes" in high places, but real representation for women in government can be won only when women work on their own behalf. Without special training and moral support in "crossing the threshhold," women will be as quickly frightened off as they have been in the past.

What have been the barriers to feminine participation in politics? Women give many reasons. Some say they do not engage in politics because the means are too "tough" or too "masculine." Since women are not there, political milieus are, of course, masculine in character. Women have changed other so-called masculine milieus by entering them. Obviously this is not a serious obstacle, although we need to keep it in mind.

A more serious problem is the tendency to define the political life too narrowly. Women seem to think politics means running for office, or it means nothing. Of course, a real political test is in holding elective office, but it takes a "machine" of political supporters to produce the office holder. Identifying other essential roles in the political life and helping women to fit into more and more of them may be a good way to begin opening the elective sphere also for women's participation.

Another important obstacle to politics as a woman's role is the simple fact that there are so few women in politics to "set the style." We will need to dig about and find all the models we can to act as starting points for defining the life-style of the political woman. We might look, for example, at the women who are the national or state officers of the League of Women Voters. Some of them are fully committed, devoting great portions of their energies and time to their "jobs" as League officers and becoming experts in their roles, fully informed and solidly trained. There are also women in elective offices,[3] and a few in appoin-

3. Although many at the national level simply inherited the job from a politician husband who died in office, they have made good use of the opportunity to develop into effective lawmakers.

tive political jobs, who would make good subjects for our study of this style. Worth studying also are another group of women who succeeded in living political lives, even though they never ran for office – Eleanor Roosevelt, Anna Rosenberg, maybe even a radical woman like Elizabeth Gurley Flynn – just to mention a few that come quickly to mind.

It is often said that a sense of powerlessness to affect events (or an unwillingness to get involved in controversial matters) has kept all individuals except a very few (and not always the best, as we know) out of the political arena. If this is so, it is clearly a very powerful obstacle for women too. I hope it is not simply wishful thinking that makes me believe this sentiment is less prevalent than it used to be. Power centers do yield, citizens have found, when citizens act through institutions – old or newly created ones – to which they are willing to pledge "their lives, their liberty, and their sacred honor," as the Negro movement has dramatically demonstrated in recent history.

Not all women, of course, will want to engage in this world's work. But for those who can and want to, we ought to be ready to provide education and support to help them overcome the obstacles in the way. We should help them define and invent this way of life that has, for any but the professional politicians, more or less disappeared from the American scene. At least one reason women have stayed out of politics is that they have not known how to get in. And in spite of all that's been said about feminine equality lately, no one is offering any concrete educational help now. And even the boldest "feminist" writers today, talk about jobs or about careers or service occupations but no one works out the idea of politics as a woman's way of life.

Of all the occupations I am considering here, this is the most significant and the most difficult. It will require the ingenuity of women and educators working together to break through the crust of custom. But it will be worth the effort.

Voluntary Service: The Style of Lady Bountiful

Unlike politics, voluntary[4] service is a leisure role in which women are very often found and the one to which they are generally counseled.

4. All the leisure occupations are essentially voluntary. But the term "volunteer" is often reserved particularly for women who work without pay in social service areas. Thus the occupation is here called "voluntary service".

But today, many women say they would rather take any little job than be a volunteer. In understanding how this has come about we come close to the crux of the problem women face in finding satisfactory substitutes for jobs.

When the lady of the manor brought beef tea to the ailing villager or sat with a dying tenant, when she raised money to build a chapel or formed a troupe of girl guides (all clichés of England's romantic literature), she was "serving" in the way the leisured woman of her day practiced this life style. It was a way to which she was committed by custom and by social need. The people she served needed her help and she gave them her service directly. She was in personal touch with the people she helped and she knew that her kind of service no one else could give or was expected to give.

In some sense, volunteer work began to fail as a satisfying leisure occupation for women when this personal quality and fixed responsibility went out of it. Many volunteers no longer work directly with the subjects they want to serve; they collect money or do clerical work instead to help "free a professional" for the service. If they do come in touch with people, it is for the performance of tasks they consider trivial. When the sense of personal responsibility for necessary service to a specific person who relied on her went, much of the significance of the volunteer service role seemed to go too.

Further, a volunteer most often does not even choose the area in which to serve; she finds herself in a post, not because she wants to perform the service involved, but rather for some personal social reason, or just to have something to do. She is drafted onto committees by a kind of social chance; whether the "cause" concerns her or not is sometimes secondary to the person who recruits her and to the others who belong.

Many women reject the role because they do not respect it, and they do not believe the people around them do either. They say that their volunteer jobs are not taken seriously; they feel used; their talents, their intelligence, even their impulses of generosity are untapped. If they make any attempt to use these qualities in their work, they are regarded as nuisances by the professionals who guide the activity. Women insist that any job, no matter how trivial or insignificant is more respected than a

volunteer role, both by their husbands and by other significant persons in the society.

And so a vicious circle is continued. The professional tolerates the volunteer hoping to get a little good out of her (especially in the area of raising money), but not planning for her anything really significant since she may not turn up to do it. The volunteer, in fact, since the tasks she is entrusted with are actually trivial, knows that anyone could do her chores if she has more important things to do, such as driving her husband to his plane (the husband of the working woman takes a cab or makes other arrangements), and so she becomes in fact "irresponsible," fulfilling the prophecy.

The shortage of professionals and the dissatisfaction of women with their present volunteer roles have led recently to a close re-examination of the total area of volunteer service. As a result, a new start is being contemplated to establish a better basis for volunteer work. At least there has been much discussion and even some action.

The hope is that the volunteer role can be reconstructed, better organized, and more seriously treated. There are plans for volunteer training, for new kinds of supervision through a special volunteer office, for opportunities for advancement and promotion as in a career. (The term "career-volunteering" is being used to express this new turn of thinking.) There are even plans for re-educating the users of volunteers, suggesting new forms of personnel practices, helping them to organize career planning opportunities for volunteers and to systematize jobs, so that the volunteers are given really useful work to do. It has even been suggested that schools of social work might train supervisors of volunteers. As a matter of fact, of all the life styles I am describing, this is probably the one that would be most easily acceptable. This is customary work for women; many women have had experience in it; many others have partial training for such work in their background. The talk of "career-volunteer" as a new role may have an impact.

For many women, however, even these adjustments will not settle the matter. The crux of the problem may be deeper than the kind of treatment received, and the promotions available. Like the part-time jobs to which women are also being directed today – teachers' aides, library helpers, scientists' assistants – these help-meet roles may not of-

fer enough freedom to engage the full range of talents of some women; and they may not seem significant enough to win the kind of commitment necessary to make the work self-meaningful.

So although there are many good volunteer jobs to be done through the existing agencies, and many women will be ready to "help out" in their free time, willing even to commit their full energies, for others we have to conceive of a life-style built on voluntary service as going beyond the handmaiden function. For the intellectually adventuresome tasks we would want to offer women, we will probably need to explore with her how to reach outside the known organizations and services, how to learn to judge for herself the society's need for service, to underline its inadequacies, explore the obstacles, and define and provide new services.

There are unserved needs in our society today, help untendered because we do not know enough about the need to identify the service, or because no agency is yet set up to provide it, or because we think it has to be provided by the expensive and scarce professionals that we do not have or cannot afford. In other eras, women of leisure were pioneers in creating the services now institutionalized and professionalized; given a chance to explore freely and deeply enough, unhampered by the crust of institutional habit, women again may show the way to new service occupations or to new ways of providing old services at the same time that they find a useful and self-respecting way of life for themselves.[5]

But for this, they must be free to be self-directing and to look afresh with new eyes to find the jobs that need to be done, such jobs as the society may not yet be ready to pay to get done. When society is prepared to accept responsibility for these needs, the services can be professionalized. But by then, some of our vigorous women may have already moved along to catch up with more new developments in the rapidly shifting social needs.

To summarize, I would say that voluntary service, the traditional occupation of non-employed women, with some adjustment, can become an occupation that is capable of shaping a satisfactory leisure style of

5. Some are already doing this; as with the other categories, one aspect of our project must be to undertake an investigation of these women who are genuine prototypes of the new "Lady-Bountiful" life-styles.

living. Much will depend, however, on the way the particular area of service is chosen. For each woman it will mean finding the activity that falls along the lines of her deepest concern and greatest talent, an occupation that is significant enough so that she sees the necessity for accepting full responsibility, and that has scope enough to call forth creative effort (i.e., it is not a little task carved out within a highly circumscribed situation). Under an appropriately structured program of preparation that provides support along with training, such a service role is not out of reach of the average college educated woman, especially if she works with a group of women like herself. For the specially gifted, proud, self-respecting woman, it may be the only kind of voluntary service job today capable of calling forth her full commitment and her talent.

"Patron" of Arts

Like voluntary service, cultural activity is a leisure role customarily assigned to women, the "culture-bearers." The traditional patrons among them (usually women of the upper class) have been sponsors of modern art (the New York Museum of Modern Art, for example, was founded as a result of the efforts of such women), collectors of art masterpieces, and the mainstay of many a symphony orchestra. For most women, however, (upper as well as middle class) who participate in cultural affairs today, the tasks are only indirectly related to the arts and fairly routine – selling tickets, for example, or giving parties to raise money.

If participation in the arts is to be a leisure occupation and the basis of a life-style for middle-class women, the role obviously cannot be the classic patron, or even the "culture bearer" role; rather, more so perhaps than with the other occupations, we must be prepared to invent a new role, adapting traditional aspects of the patron of art role to shape a leisure occupation that can fit women today, a citizen of a democratic society faced with a sharply expanding cultural life. To try to identify this role, we must look with new awareness not only at the style of the modern woman, but also at the status of art in the society today. For it is in the modern cultural context that the new role of patronage will have to find its form and its substance.

The most significant fact about the contemporary cultural scene, according to many commentators, is the vogue that the arts are now enjoying, a remarkable reversal from a time not too long ago when the arts

were ignored by all but a very small section of the population. The growing interest raises hopes of the possibility of creating a rich cultural life in America. And as the quantity of attention to art continues to mount, earlier question[5] about the authenticity of the so-called "art explosion" seem to be fading, replaced by a flurry of action aimed at organizing the new interest. In all parts of the country, people, many of whom have had very little experience with art, are forming councils, committees, and other associations to support the arts and to bring them into the local public sphere – playing, in part, the role of modern patron.

But few men or women in our country have been properly prepared for such a role, either in school (where the arts are still generally ignored) or through experience (many communities have in the past offered only meager opportunities for participation). Actually, all educated people (i.e. the enlightened public) in today's art conscious milieu ought to become more literate in the arts – tutored not only in aesthetic appreciation but also in the economics and politics of art. They are the group that will make and execute decisions that can control the destiny of art; they will be on the committees that hire artists; they will serve on urban renewal projects and judge plans that may or may not include a concern for aesthetics.

But the arts, as an area of our national life today, need even more help than this; they need the services of people with a special concern, people willing to become thoroughly trained, and to devote large blocks of time and energy on their behalf – willing to accept, in short, a final responsibility for the life of the arts in the community. Women with leisure, who find their deep interest lies in this direction, should be encouraged to seek here an opportunity to build a self-rewarding and so-

5. From the beginning there has been considerable fear that we will misuse the opportunity for a cultural renaissance. Although lately expressions of alarm have grown less insistent, the concern is still a factor in the climate. In a very recent statement, Russell Lynes, a generally sanguine commentator on the cultural scene, warns: "...For all the sun that shines on the arts today (and a good deal does), there is a kind of smog in the atmosphere. Some of the smog, to stretch the metaphor, comes from industrial smoke--the results of our concern with material and creature comforts at the expense of spiritual comforts. Some of it, however, is an excess of goodwill, which produces inevitably an intellectual and sentimental fog. It appears that the arts have too many well-meaning acquaintances and friends and too few lovers." "Who Wants Art?" Harpers, July, 1965.)

cially useful leisure occupation.[6] Properly understood, and pursued with purpose and persistence, this role can put a woman in touch with the "mainstream" of the society, and call forth a commitment significant enough to shape her style of life.

What will it involve, this occupation of leisure, in the contemporary world of art and life? In the shifting cultural picture, models of the occupation and the style of life it can lead to will not be easy to locate; even the precise functions that need to be performed are not yet clear. Perhaps more so than with the other occupations, the modern arts patron role will need to be extemporized. But from the masses of material being written on the subject of art and society, it is possible to name at least some of the things that need doing, tasks that in combination will, I believe, provide the basis for whatever form the role eventually will take.

To set it off clearly from the classic patron concept, I shall call this occupation "citizen-patron," implying a non-aristocratic, popular role suitable in a democratic, middle-class, pluralist culture. The citizen-patron, as I envision her, will be a leading member of the enlightened public that is, I think, the ultimate patron today in both the public and the private sector. She will act as an individual, but often as one among a collection of citizens who together provide the variety of support the arts, the artist, and the society require. In my conception, a citizen-patron will accept responsibility for providing at least three kinds of service – artistic, practical, and social – all closely inter-related, and mutually enriching. Although any one of these services by itself is worth doing, in my view, we will have a full-scale leisure occupation that can be the cornerstone of a leisure life-style only if the three are combined in one role.

The first, and central, function of the citizen-patron is to accept aesthetic responsibility as a non-artist, to nourish the art (or arts if she can encompass more than one at once) by being an understanding audience. As audience she acts not merely as a passive purchaser of pleas-

6. Women ought to take note, by the way, that art patronage at all levels is becoming such serious business in the country, that men are taking over as "culture bearers." The annual convention of Arts Councils of America was this year for the first time attended by more men than women.

ure, but as a "collaborator" in a tacit but deliberate contract with the artist to help him achieve the greatest art possible.[7] In addition to attending the art events regularly, she will study to become a connoisseur of the art she supports, an amateur connoisseur, if you prefer, but cultivated and discriminating, sure of her taste and her judgment. She may or she may not be an amateur producer of art herself, but in either case she will know enough to value not merely the latest thing, but also the good efforts that may be out of fashion. She will know also that in art (as Harold Clurman put it) you cannot get everything great right away, and therefore she will not always demand masterpieces or successes but give the artist the necessary opportunity to experiment by supporting him even when he fails. At the same time, she will be able to differentiate between genuine artistic effort and "Kitsch". The citizen-patron, in other words, will affect the production of art by being a cultivated and discriminating audience for art, offering her services both directly and indirectly as circumstances make possible.

The second function of the citizen-patron will be to provide some necessary practical help to the art her critical judgment leads her to support. She will see to it, for example, that there is financial help, (by buying the works of art and encouraging others to do so, joining or organizing community-wide activities to raise funds to cover deficits in the budget of art institutions, lobbying for legislative aid at the various levels of government, etc.); she will help to arrange for exhibitions and performances (by organizing local councils as sponsors, publishing calendars of events, developing arts festivals, building theaters and museums, helping to form a quartet, etc.); and finally she will be concerned that opportunities be created in the community for education both for the artist and the audience. In this function the citizen-patron acts to insure favorable conditions for the artist to devote himself to his art, and for the institutions that support art to find the means for carrying on their functions.

7. This service may sound grand, but it can take many simple forms. A director of a drama school, who conducts a professional theater in the Middle West, for example, has a special audience group as consultants; they are invited to attend plays he produces, and to act as critic, adviser, and consultant to him. And in some of the new resident theaters around the country, members of the subscription audience are on a reading committee to help select plays for the repertory program.

Finally, the third area in which the citizen-patron serves art is to help relate art to the community as an element of importance in the social good. Assuming that the arts ought to touch the life of as many persons in a community as possible,[8] leaving none out, not even (perhaps especially not) the uneducated or the poor, the citizen-patron makes herself aware of gaps and seeks the means to close them. She tries, for instance to see to it that everyone has access to art – those in suburbs as well as those in the core city, those who have never heard of the arts and those who may have once decided they didn't have any need for them.[9] In another aspect of her social role, the citizen-patron, having become herself sensitive to the appearance of the community, will try to awaken public sensibilities, a task especially important in today's city where aesthetic considerations are only now being introduced in connection with urban planning.

Obviously there are many things to be done. And yet, it will not be an easy task to win acceptance for this leisure style. The sphere of the arts has been for so long depreciated in our value system that I can foresee several problems right away. It will be hard, for instance, for this leisure occupation, no matter how soberly or carefully pursued, to win the kind of respect that will permit it to be the basis of a life-style. Another problem, as I have already indicated, is that there are no clear models. In the case of the other two styles of living I discussed, I could pick out from among the women that I knew or have read about modern prototypes on which to base a "job" description. In the area of the arts, I cannot do this. Finally, it will not be easy to adapt even those activities already shaped in the field; they have been for so long identified almost

8. This assumption makes sense to me for two reasons: first because beauty will come at last into the public sphere (August Heckscher's goal) only if the community as a whole is sympathetic to it. And second, there is some ground for feeling today that the arts can help us to overcome deprivation or other social limitations (mechanization, for example).

9. This kind of effort to distribute art more widely is well demonstrated by the work of the Delacorte Mobile Theater in New York which takes Shakespearean plays into New York City parks, some of which are in the poorest neighborhoods of the city; as an experiment, this activity has been surprisingly successful. (See Shakespeare in the Neighborhood, a report by Richard Faust and Charles Kodus, the Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1965.)

entirely with so-called "enrichment" activities that many women and men think of as pure busy work.

This is not to say that ultimately this role will be less satisfactory than the others. On the contrary, in the long run it may lead to a most viable life-style. The destiny of the arts in America will depend on individuals like the citizen-patron, who was willing to exert care on their behalf.[10] The field is wide open for women with enough concern and talent in the sphere of the arts, to wager time and effort in finding out what needs to be done and how to do it. They will discover, I am sure, many opportunities for improvisation and maybe even a few allies (among women in symphony societies, on the boards of museums, opera companies, regional theater, and especially in the arts councils). There is a role here that I believe can challenge and stimulate, can make use of a variety of talents and skills, and can call forth a commitment firm enough to provide the depth of living and doing that go to make a fine life-style. With help from a careful educational program, women could learn to respect such a role, and society needs them in it.

"Gentleman - Scholar": The Contemplative Life-Style

An educator on the West Coast has suggested a useful contemporary role – the amateur specialist,[11] that is, a person well and fully educated in an area of special knowledge for social or personal use, but not for professional ends. The leisure occupation I call "gentleman-scholar" is based on this concept; a life pattern in which a central focus is study, hard and thorough grounding in an area of great interest not tied to a career.

By far, the most congenial to the educator, this role is still, to my mind, the least likely to be converted into a socially-blessed activity – since it is least action-oriented. And yet, this style has much to recom-

10. Russell Lynes, in the article referred to earlier, puts it this way: "...The small voice of private passion has been drowned out by the brouhaha of cultural fashion ... But it will be he, (the private voice) ... who with the artist can change this era of unparalleled artistic prosperity from one of reckless cultural overkill to any age that may one day be called 'golden.'"

11. Broadly conceived this term might describe any of the leisure roles. Here it is restricted to specialties specifically in the areas of scholarship and contemplation.

mend it, and for those willing to accept a somewhat idiosyncratic role, it offers possibly the greatest riches of variety.

The gentlemen scholar spends his time and energy essentially pursuing an idea, scholarship, a learned hobby. He may simply read everything he can get his hands on concerning his subject of intense interest; but, more likely, if this is to be a life-style, he will do things in the world – join a club (the Shaw society) write esoteric papers to deliver there or for a journal; he will be a guardian of the public spirit and write to the newspapers on subjects of ethics or community values, or join a committee to support conservation of our historic landmark. And sometimes scholars will get embroiled in real battles. One lady I know joined the local historical society after leaving her library job, only to get involved in trying to save an old historical house the town should have cared about and didn't. (She found she had to go into politics to do this, and she ran for office as town selectman, thus changing her life-style entirely.)

The virtue of this style is its infinite flexibility. At one end of a broad range of possible activities, a "gentleman-scholar" may concern herself with a purely personal interest and build on that. A desire to run a beehive, for example, can lead a gentleman-scholar into a wide choice of study and action; the beehive can become the basis of a scholarly hobby to retire to, or lead to fellowship with like-minded beekeepers near and far, or with scholars of other such subjects. At the other end of a continuum of possible occupations, gentlemen scholars can fill a much needed contemporary social function – as knowledgeable laymen, to act as a check on the experts. A gentleman scholar may, for instance, master an area of modern science well enough to become a lay critic of scientific endeavor. The reality of such a layman's role in relation to science was underlined for me recently by a physicist. He said that laymen today have a responsibility to keep up with the scientific revolution, and they can do so, if they don't try to understand it all (no one tries to know <u>all</u> literatures, he pointed out). By getting to know one well-defined area thoroughly, they can achieve a kind of amateur expertise. If, he reasoned, among many laymen, individuals are expert in small scientific areas, together they would be capable of critically analyzing the total scientific picture.

A similar point, also indicating the social need for "amateur specialists," was made recently by Harrison Salisbury (of The New York Times) with respect to the sphere of international politics. In an informal lecture to an adult education institute, he said that our tendency to put blind faith in specialists is today a danger. In their handling of international affairs, in the conduct of a cold war, experts need checks and balances provided by educated laymen. We must have many people in the society, he said, who are deeply knowledgeable about aspects of foreign affairs so that they may question the experts.

Other areas of public life also have room for gentlemen-scholars who can perform useful social functions as their occupations of leisure. But the goal of service to the community is not the only emphasis of this leisure occupation. For those who are temperamentally suited to the contemplative life, the goal may be simply the enlargement of the individual spirit, discovering the pleasure of intellectual and spiritual growth pursued for its own sake.

Like the arts patron role, this leisure occupation may eventually provide the basis for a most useful life-style in the emerging world. But, right now, the occupation in this life-style can seem dilettantish unless style-setters are careful to apply the proper style setting formula — serious preparation, commitment, accepting implications for "work." As in the other occupational areas, gentlemen scholars will find moral and intellectual satisfaction in becoming rigorously trained "experts" in areas of their choice — even if, as experts, they are as I said earlier "amateur specialists" rather than professionals. And often they will be in the mainstream of life acting on behalf of the society in the area of their specialty, in the best tradition of Emerson's American Scholar.[12]

And so I have come to the end of the exercise of identifying the roles upon which I believe leisure styles of significant living can be built. It is important to remember, however, that it has been an exercise, not an attempt to define the roles of leisure in a final form. As I have already said many times, I am convinced that the roles need to be invented and

12. In his essay, "The American Scholar," Emerson wrote: "Action is with the scholar subordinate, but it is essential. Without it he is not yet man. Without it thought can never ripen into truth." (As quoted in an article by Donald Walhout, "The American Scholar," Journal of Higher Education, June 1965, p. 302).

shaped by experience. In our programs of education we will have to set up conditions wherein invention is encouraged and tested out.

The list of occupations I have offered is by no means exhaustive of the possibilities I feel sure exist. Within the broad categories of occupations I have treated as units, there are obviously a great many different kinds of "jobs." Moreover, I have been deliberately restrained in my imagining, sticking as close as possible to the facts of the real world and the immediate present. Ultimately a better way to find new occupations of leisure might be to cut them out of whole cloth, in fanciful disregard of what is now possible or reasonable. For the sake of our immediate clientele, however, mature women of the middle classes, it seemed better to stick to present reality.

What I wanted most to do in making these tentative definitions of leisure occupation and the life-styles they shape, was to add weight to my contention that there are real possibilities in the notion of self-meaningful leisure occupations as alternative goals (to job training) in programs of continuing education for women.

But whether these can be realized will depend ultimately on the extent of the educational investment the woman and the society are willing to make, and the kind of support we are prepared to provide them. But what kinds of educational programs do these goals – leisure occupations to shape liberal styles of life – imply? Clearly, this is a subject that cannot be given full discussion at this point; a workable plan probably ought to be worked out in relation to setting up a particular program. And yet, I am loathe to leave the subject without attempting to suggest what, in my thinking, the broad strategy ought to include, if for no other reason than to add further reality to the idea. For that reason, I have sketched out the plan that appears in the next section, not by any means a ready-made program for instant use, but rather a starting point for thinking about a plan.

SCHOOLING FOR NEW LIFE-STYLES

Premises and Plans

My educational strategy rests on premises that can be inferred from the earlier analysis of the problem itself and of the goals it suggests. One obvious assumption, for instance, is that the program emphasis will be on liberal education. While goals will include the ability to perform in a particular line of "work," the object is not to fit students into a formal professional role, but rather into occupations for which no exact "job description" yet exists. The "job" (which, by the way, may encompass a constellation of specialties for "amateur" use) and the preparation for it will both have to be improvised, with the student sharing the creative task. To me, this clearly calls for liberal and general education.

A second clear assumption, not unrelated to the first, is the need for a program offering long term education-in-depth. There is no easy crash program to give people the capacity to adopt a new "liberal" life style; the change required in these students may come close to a kind of "resocialization" – not just acquiring new specialties and new expertise, but also finally new values, a new outlook, a changed perspective and posture. This means education both profound and far reaching.

But, on the other hand, we know that the students will not be children. They will know much and they will be able to do much. While the process of "resocialization" goes on, therefore, they will need to "work" and to live like adults. Thus, I think, still another element called for in this educational plan is a study-while-doing arrangement of the schedule.

Moreover, since we are to work with women, who according to our reasoning will have to cope with known handicaps (confusion about their status as women, conflict about role and identity, a low level of aspiration, lack of adequate preparation), another assumption we can make is that we will have to provide a solid array of supportive mechanisms to overcome barriers both physical and psychological.

Reflecting on such implications of need as these, I include as a fundamental feature, in my conception of a proper plan to educate for new life-styles, a special school, a place set off by itself where a controlled environment can be set up to contain practical and emotional supports to buttress a program of intensive study. This specially created sanctuary is, I believe, the principal element in a workable strategy for this program; in a sense it is the context within which other necessary features can be fitted. I want to discuss this special "school" further and in more detail, to elaborate its purposes and to say something about the accompanying curriculum and activities. But first I would like to turn attention to another critical element that must also be built solidly into the educational plan.

We will need to set up a system of ritual and service that can provide "bridges" between the sheltering school and the outside world where the acid test of our efforts must be made. Such "bridges" are mandatory for a program leading to new life-styles, but actually they ought to be part of all programs of adult liberal education, as they often are of career-directed programs. Because this seems to me a critical point, I want to take a moment to discuss it separately.

Bridges to Life-Styles

In adapting educational programs for adults, and now for women especially, educators have been able to make many constructive changes in the conditions of learning to suit adult life patterns. They have adjusted matters of time and place, offering opportunities for part-time, evening, and independent study, and recently for women, a part-time schedule in the daytime. It has even been acknowledged that life experience is educational and can be used as a source of knowledge about the subject of the course. And lately in a few places, adult experience is even judged in special cases to be worthy of credit towards a degree.

In one necessary sense, however, adaptation has not yet been well made — a gap which may account for the fact that non-vocational adult programs so far, while they enroll so many women, have not been of much real use to them. Although most educators accept as self-evident the fact that for adults, educational goals are, of necessity, ends to be won soon in time, even when education for adults is not emergency education (e.g., vocational retraining), it is still mainly preparatory for some vague future role.

This seems to me particularly a problem in liberal education where ultimate goals tend to be vague, involving such grand objectives as "developing better citizens," "fulfilling potential," "self-development," or the like. Rarely does the school establish a connection between the preparation and the life task that is related to it. (Those programs in which people already in leadership roles come to be trained for these are an exception, but then these are much like vocational or training courses for people in new or changing jobs.) Still, when an adult completes a course in world affairs, for instance, it is implied that he has been prepared not only to have opinions about political problems but also presumably to act in relation to the rising issues of the day.

Before we attempt to help women to try on new life styles, we will, of necessity, have to reconsider this approach. We will need to build into our carefully designed programs a way of putting the adult women within hitting distance of the specific occupation to which a commitment is to be made, and within which the life-style can be developed. This sounds so obvious and simple that one is tempted to stop right here. But the fact that the idea is so seldom applied in programs of liberal education means it may be more elusive than it seems. It may be worth saying in somewhat more detail what may be lacking, and what needs to be added.

Suppose we look at what happens in the adult education programs which rationalize their purposes in the words: "Preparing the individual for effective participation in a changing world." So long as the university is asked only to help people do better those public tasks they are already doing, things go fairly well. Thus it provides some good courses for people who are in leadership positions, to make them better leaders. Similarly, it can and it sometimes does provide courses for elected officials to help them perform their newly won positions with credit. But for those who come with no specific need, and most of those who enter the liberal courses are in this category, we have not even considered the possibility that we were expected to find the means to help them, for example, to "participate effectively in a changing world." This is one reason I believe that such well meant efforts as "education for public responsibility" continue to be short on impact, and essentially dilettantish in quality.

When the educational experience ends at the door of the school, the student going in to the society, even if full of the knowledge he has been equipped with for facing it, finds about him an amorphous mass of activities going on, most significant aspects of which have been pre-empted by professionals. The individual is helpless to find a meaningful place for himself or a meaningful way to use the knowledge he has at some pains acquired.

Something of the same sort may be said to happen in courses which aim at "helping people develop their full potentialities." But unless help in "placement" of people into new roles is part of the educational process, the bite is taken out of the educational program, the people we educate are not prepared to fulfill their potentialities until they have a clear place where their talents and new skills will be used. Self-development (another favorite category of goals in adult education) I believe is not completed in the classroom. More often than not, it is only through acting in the world of affairs and affecting it in some measure that the self-sense itself is enlarged.

There is a critical interval, I believe, between school and life, in which the individual adult student left to himself can lose his way, become frustrated or discouraged, or distracted by pressing immediate demands. This critical interval is not merely a matter of time, although that too can be a trap. The interval is psychological too; it is a barrier set up by fear of the new, of not knowing what to do, where to go, how to act.

This was brought vividly home to me during a recent series of interviews with art producers about their conception of their audiences. I was struck by common statements to the effect that the educator ought to take the student "by the hand" to art events if he hopes to help him become a better appreciator of art in the world where it exists. It cannot be taken for granted, they said, that people will go on their own after completing a course in art appreciation. Not knowing the world which they are supposed to enter, many are reluctant to go forth into it. Thus the experience completed in school often has no consequence in behavior.

Yet notice, in the two areas of education that are taken most seriously by educators, how the effort of hedging the critical interval, relating directly the education and ultimate life goal, is taken for granted.

The first is professional education, the second education preparatory for further education. (Both are goals, by the way, that are presently dominating women's education and have been mainly responsible for the new services provided in recently established programs for women. In career development programs there are always services to bridge the interval between the educational experience and the assumption of role. The placement counselor, the vocational agencies both private and public, serve as a link between educational preparation and the role to be assumed. And of course, it is expected that learning will continue on the job, and in special courses the university will organize for future refreshment. No one leaves to chance the preparation and the use of that preparation in professional education areas.

Similarly, in programs where the goal is preparation for further education, especially at undergraduate levels, we note built-in efforts to develop skills for future tasks, to encourage a desire to go on for the next step, to help find available resources, etc. In addition there are educational counseling, personal counseling, and a variety of other services to tackle the interval between completion of one phase of education, and the beginning of a new one.

My point is simply this. A program such as the one discussed here for development of new leisure styles of living should not be considered complete unless it attempts to effect an actual enlargement of the individual's life boundaries. This can be accomplished only if the school does not see itself as simply getting people ready for something, but also as at least partially responsible for helping the individual to establish the "connections" with the world outside that can provide a framework for active application of the preparation undergone. Some apparatus to institute a bridging function, I believe, will have to be a built-in feature of any strategy for the education of women for leisure occupations and the new styles of living they imply.

Having noted this imperative, I can return to a consideration of the kind of experimental "school" I think we need to set up for the achievement of these goals.

Experimental School: The Montaigne Institute

Let me say, first off, that I have chosen this name, Montaigne Institute, for the school simply because it permits me to use as a banner

Montaigne's most fitting phrase: "For varied explorations of innumerable styles of being a self." It is a most apt definition of what I think will be the underlying business of the school. A Montaigne Institute, as I imagine it, is a place in which to explore, study for, and practice occupations of leisure for many new styles of life.

The school can be elaborate or simple, depending on resources and the extent of activity undertaken – a single room or a castle – but it must be a distinct unit, clearly identified, able to offer opportunity for a communal experience. Students in the Montaigne Institute, not able to rely on rewards or support from the society at large, must here have a "community" to belong to, from which to draw strength and a sense of identity,[1] a center where courage and determination can be reinforced during the critical period of trial and search, and where personal rewards and recognition (in lieu of salary) can enhance a growing sense of worth.

In short, the principal contribution to the individual that the Montaigne Institute makes is the moral support it provides for a venture that is out of line with dominant social values. Ultimately, a Montaigne Institute scholar will achieve, we would hope, inner strength to stand serenely on her own ground of ultimate concern, pursuing her life in roles freely chosen, without regard for public approval or lack of it. But in the short term, Institute scholars will require the supports the society gives to a life based on work – recognition, comradeship, identity. Such support is possible within a community of scholars – a company of like-minded women, a well identified place wherein to meet with them, and a vigorous program of learning.

A Montaigne Institute provides also, however, a center for exploration of the whole idea of new life styles, an experimental station where tasks are defined and procedures elaborated. It may even be the laboratory where the leisure "style" can be practiced in the early stages of preparation. This function of the Institute will be clearer later, after the discussion of curriculum.

1. Erik Erikson says a sense of identity comes from "... roles for which acceptance by significant others is assured ..." Without, I hope, oversimplifying Erikson, I would like to believe a Montaigne Institute will offer both the "roles" and the "significant others" to assure their acceptance.

Structurally, a Montaigne Institute, although set up as a distinct unit, ought to be incorporated within a university so that resources of scholarship and faculty will be available. When necessary (as for suburban women, or women with young children, for whom the distance to a campus is a real barrier), I believe small branches of a Montaigne Institute could be set up off-campus in many local communities. In the early stages of a woman's "re-education" in a Montaigne Institute (a period devoted, as I suggest below, to self-discovery and discovery of a vocation), the main resources of a university probably need not be constantly at hand; teachers, materials, and other such resources could be borrowed as needed. Later, when women are ready to specialize, they may have to be on a campus, but perhaps by then they may be freer to move around, and the problem of how each one can accomplish her specialization can be individually worked out.

Internally, a Montaigne Institute should operate as a cooperative project, with the faculty and students sharing tasks and responsibilities. The mature women students in this school will all be at least partly educated (some highly so); they will come to the school with experience from jobs, volunteer work, household management, and family guidance. Much of what needs to be done, they can themselves accomplish, serving apprenticeships within the school, as they learn new competencies under the guidance of a qualified faculty. (Here the dictates of sound pedagogy fall in line with the virtue of trimming the budget.)

The Montaigne Institute ought to encourage, and, in fact, demand self-effort. Requiring women to work on their own behalf will help them conquer paralysis arising from the sense of powerlessness. Actually working in the program should boost morale and enhance self-respect. But the whole idea fairly insists on a self-help approach – adults finding their own way to discovering and fulfilling their own aspirations. They may need help and support from a faculty in learning how to go about finding out where they want to go, what is involved in getting there, and where to get further help. But they ought to be able to "drive" themselves.

It is difficult to conjecture, in this enterprise, how extensive a faculty would be needed. Actually, a school like the Institute I am imagining here could use any number of qualified persons (i.e., people with teaching power mixed with ingenuity, flexibility, and a sense of mission). But a

good faculty is hard to come by, and I believe we could get along if we had to, to begin with, with a tiny permanent staff (maybe even only one superior director-tutor-counselor) relying on the total university staff and structure for individual courses. (Personally, I would like to try it two ways, with a special faculty and without. With a group of adults there may be virtue in both approaches.)

The Curriculum

In line with the mood of the project and school, the curriculum design should be as flexible as possible; we must avoid too early closure in our improvisations. On the other hand, it is easy enough to foresee what a core program is likely to be for it has to be based, as we saw earlier, on a classical notion – the re-education of the whole person.

My conception is of a course of study conducted simultaneously (or separately, if necessary) along three lines: (1) discovery of self and of a "vocation"; (2) acquiring experience, a specialty, and a commitment; and (3) building for continuity. Let us see what each of these means.

Toward the Discovery of Self and a "Vocation."

One premise underlying the approach of the Montaigne Institute is that a style of living (and the leisure occupation involved) ought to be based on work unrelated to an individual's deepest concern, using all possible talents and powers the individual has to offer, in the conviction that work so chosen does not have to be paid for or win public recognition in order to make sense of one's life. The first line of study, therefore, involves as one step, a search for inner motives, a quest for the ground of one's ultimate concern. While this is the first line of education, it is also the ultimate goal and, therefore, a continuing quest all through the period at the Institute and beyond. Perhaps what the Montaigne Institute really teaches at this level is never to stop searching. Someone once defined happiness as "being engaged in doing that which is most meaningful to us." Built into the curriculum therefore is the opportunity for a continuing quest for self-knowledge, a steady effort to find "work" that is self-meaningful, and thus to increase the capacity for commitment and action that" ... signifies the sureness of the soul."

How is self-discovery pursued?

It is possible that this end can be accomplished fully, as some people feel, only through psychcanalysis. I am not convinced, however, that this is so, and since it is impossible anyway, I think we should look beyond formal therapy for any natural method that makes sense. Among the women's programs described earlier, for example, are programs that feature human relations workshops, modified guidance or counseling services, and some orientation courses, all aimed at some form of self-discovery; many of these have shown considerable vigor. We might begin by borrowing these ideas and build on them as we go along. We can also, of course, revive an older means of self-study, writing – keeping a personal journal, possibly, or just writing creatively for the sake of self-expression. Accompanied by faculty guidance, this too can be a disciplined way to search for one's deeper thoughts and feelings.

In addition to these more or less direct introspective efforts, we might try also introspection through intellectual inquiry, the means once so strongly advocated by Socrates as the way to live the "examined life" that is "worth living." And so I would add to the curriculum, a continuing seminar to inquire into contemporary American society, seeking the meaning of events and exploring personal values. The focus here is on current issues, and the seminars can draw on a number of disciplines - anthropology (to consider the culture concept), philosophy (to examine moral purpose), science (to understand nature and the modern scientific revolution), history (to acquire perspective), and art and literature (to explore beauty).

Another kind of search in this seminar would be conducted in the world of affairs, to see what is going on out there now and, on the basis of such exploration into the character of the times, to find out what one would most want to see done there. This will mean conducting some informal research along with the study, looking anew at the society, especially at the local community, to see what now needs doing that is not being done or not being done well and with grace. In this informal research, Institute scholars can focus also on questions related to defining new styles of life – exploring the areas where leisure occupations might be found, (politics, the service agencies, and art), identifying further the needs and the tasks; studying men and women who are living leisure lifestyles in this age, finding out how they manage to get along in them;

seeking new kinds of "bridges" between the Institute and the society; and looking into the many other questions that are sure to arise once the Institute is launched.

As she thus studies and searches herself and the world for insight into the area of her concerns, a woman will be beginning to experience the "style" of leisure occupations, developing the attitudes and habits of "free-work."

Acquiring Experience and a Specialty

This part of the program is especially focussed on acquiring specialties and gaining practice in a specialty. I see things being done here in two stages. As soon as students have any inkling of which of the four leisure areas they want to begin exploring, they are placed in a group with other students of similar interest. In consultation with faculty, they plan an investigation into the area. They develop reading lists and seminars. They take aptitude tests if these seem called for. They visit agencies and schools. They audit classes in selected subjects. They can even call a conference or do a piece of research, or go into apprenticeship a while. They work as a team, and sometimes alone. When they are finished, they should understand what is involved in the work they are exploring, know all the real facts and pitfalls, and be aware of the depth of preparation involved. If at the end of this intensive inquiry they still want to go into the area, they are ready for a commitment. If not, they look at other areas in the same way. I would hope that we could average matters so that a woman could try out several "specialties" before settling on one occupation. When she chooses a leisure occupation, it should be on the basis of knowledge and experience in several different areas, as well as on the self-discovery that is being simultaneously pursued.

In stage two, therefore, the woman concentrates on serious preparation for her chosen leisure occupation. She studies as needed, independently, and in courses at the university or elsewhere. In addition, during this stage, all the bridge-building machinery we can muster (as a self-service agency the Montaigne Institute may have invented some new ones in addition to those discussed earlier) is brought into play to help a woman find the means to practice an occupation in the manner that, as we said earlier, can raise it to a style of life.

Building for Continuity

The third line of activity in the Montaigne Institute will be to provide for continuing education. If the future is half as uncertain as we now think it is, it is unpredictable enough to make us wary of any program of education, even in well prescribed areas, that pretends to be terminal. In a Montaigne Institute, especially, the important mood must be intellectual openness -- continuing reflection on what one is doing and why it is being done, to preserve the creative will to reassess regularly the environment, check the tendency to become rigid, to continue to promote and develop the idea of leisure occupations. In the self-discovery workshops and in the seminars, the need for continuing self-examination is stressed, and in all aspects of the program, high value is placed on developing a breadth of concern as well as on digging ever deeper into special areas.

We ought not to permit a woman to "graduate" from the Montaigne Institute. We could give out "licenses" to practice in a specialty, but with the understanding that it will be necessary to return periodically for reflection, study, and continuing self-examination.

I think it is time to stop this conjecturing now; I have been drawn into giving more detail than I had intended. What I wanted to communicate most I think is clear: it is not going to be an easy program, probably not a cheap one, and withal a venturesome one. But it can be done. And if it works at all, there will issue forth from the Montaigne Institutes a tide of untapped human energy and human imagination that will be well worth the investment and the risk. For women, it may well provide the source of strength to accomplish the mission they began early in this century -- to add to the public sphere those special "feminine virtues." For the society, this release of feminine talent may mean a new spiritual resource. I quote again and finally from Erik H. Erikson:

> Maybe if women would only gain the determination to represent as image providers and law givers what they have always stood for privately in evolution and in history ... they might well be mobilized to add an ethically restraining, because truly supranational, power to politics in the widest sense.[2]

2. Erik H. Erikson "Inner and Outer Space: Reflections on Womanhood," Daedalus, Spring, 1964.

ENVOI: FEMINISM RESUMED

If I seem to have gone far to carry out my original purpose – to explore the educational implications of the present concern among women for status and for a role in the world of affairs – it is because very early in my inquiry I became convinced that resolution of these issues was intricately related to management of the work-leisure problem in the modern world. Women early "automated" from their "jobs" have reported that disemployment provides a difficult and anxious freedom. The fact that finally they felt impelled to look for any kind of job as the way to solve a growing feeling of uselessness seems to me a warning that we must find some way to break out of our present binding reliance on paid employment as the only source of meaning we know, the only kind of work we honor, and the only goal we seem sure it is worth our while to educate for. (Maybe it is actually the only goal we know how to educate for.)

Thus I came early to the conclusion that educational energy must be applied to finding alternative styles of living based not on a job or even a career, but rather on leisure occupations within the liberal life-style. This must be done not only to help women find meaningful roles today, but so that all of us may move toward a society characterized by leisure with less of the toll of human happiness than such cultural shifts left to chance generally exact. I believe we can engage women in this venture because at least some of them are ready to take a chance. They can engage in serious preparation for work in life-styles which are not career bound. They can afford the risk. They have nothing to lose but their free time, and they have a possible life-style to gain. But they cannot do it on their own. At least not many have so far. Social change comes hard, it seems, and new ways of living are not easily developed, accepted, and rewarded. A woman will need help in deciding where to head, and in having a fighting chance to get there. And so was born my Montaigne Institute for the Education of Women.

The fact that I am advocating an approach that is not sex-linked – men and women have a similar stake in exploring new life occupations – must not be interpreted as a denial of the appropriateness of special programs for women. On the contrary, I can see two reasons to continue offering special programs to women, either one of which by itself would be justification enough. For one thing, women need the extra attention, the encouragement to overcome passivity and fear, or whatever other feelings and attitudes keep them from full efforts on their own behalf. But more importantly, in focussing on this special group, we can more easily learn how to go about the whole difficult task.

I have not meant to suggest, either, that we abandon efforts to help women gain equality of status; it is a task that, I firmly believe, ought to be accomplished, and soon, for everyone's well-being – men's, women's, and society's. But in the light of all the forces at play in the world today, one may wager that the inequalities will inevitably be eliminated, resolved not so much by overturning barriers that keep women uncomfortable in the so-called masculine spheres, but rather that, as a consequence of continuing industrialization and automation, the dominant masculine value of status-through-career is modified, and "feminine" virtues and activities – speculation, creativity, pursuit of beauty, humanitarianism – can achieve equal place in our hierarchy of values. Inequalities of status and ways of living may be dissolved, therefore, not by drawing women into the exclusive masculine spheres, but by moving them both into new spheres altogether.

The only force that can sustain inequality between men and women in the changing world, I believe, would be the persistence of the present bias against women's developing fully their intellectual powers. It is this that limits women's aspirations and achievement more than lack of opportunity in the world of careers. And standing against this obstacle has to be, in my thinking, a fundamental element in any serious program for the education of women.

And so, finally, I reveal the feminist bias in my total scheme. The hidden agenda (perhaps a better word is hope) behind the Montaigne Institutes, is that they can provide a "community" that will not only encourage women to have the "courage of their native intelligence" but also give them an opportunity to use it. And this for all women – those at home and those at whatever kind of work they wish.

All women with intellectual "work" to do ought to be welcome in some aspect of the Institute program, and Institute members ought to be prepared to go out to encourage less out-reaching women to explore the intellectual life. I am not opposed, you understand, to the emotional or physical aspects of living; nor do I really believe you can separate out the brain work from other aspects of life. But I do think we need to emphasize this aspect of a woman's human nature since in the public sphere it is so often played down.

Thus I end this paper with this confession of my unreconstructed feminism. In this era of struggle for equal rights, I feel sure that equality for women is on the agenda, too. And we must see that it is, at least to the extent that women have equal opportunity for using all their human talents. For, as someone recently remarked, talents not used for creation will be used for destruction. If women must repress their intelligence at the dictates of a feminine mystique or because there is no place to use them effectively, some will turn this good power into a force against themselves, their families or society. Talent, as Milton found "... is death to hide ..." and, as the biblical parable has it, it is sinful to allow it to waste.

Educators can do much for women and for the society too by focussing on the many different kinds of work there are to do today that can involve fully a woman's talent and energy – even if they don't earn her a salary. "The aim of man's life is the unfolding of his powers," said Eric Fromm. He meant women too, of course, in that masculine generalization.

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 19 1968
on Adult Education